

REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of September 21, 2004, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-41 are now pending, of which claims 1, 22, and 27 are independent. In this amendment, claims 1 and 22-27 have been amended, and claims 28-41 have been added. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added.

As an administrative matter, applicant notes that the initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 received with the non-final Office action of September 21, 2004 did not include initials corresponding to the non-patent reference designated AQ on the returned Form PTO-1449. Applicant respectfully requests a copy of the Form PTO-1449 be returned with initials corresponding to the non-patent reference designated AQ. For the Examiner's convenience, a courtesy copy of the Form PTO-1449 mailed on April 15, 2002 and a courtesy copy of the non-patent reference designated AQ on the Form PTO-1449 are provided.

Rejection under Section 101

Claims 22 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 22 and 24-26 have been amended, *inter alia*, to recite a "computer program tangibly embodied in a computer-readable medium, the computer program product including instructions that, when executed," perform some operations. Applicant believes that the amendments address all of the issues identified in the Office action of September 21, 2004 and requests withdrawal of this rejection in light of the amendments to claims 22 and 24-26.

Rejection under Section 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for having no structure for supporting the functionality of the apparatus claim. In making this rejection, the Office action of September 21, 2004 cites MPEP § 2114. Claim 27 is directed to a communications apparatus for retrieving electronic data from a communications system. Claim 27 recites that the apparatus is configured to perform several enumerated functions, namely: establish a connection to the communications system using a first account of the user, initiate a first communication

session over the connection associated with the first account of the user, and automatically initiate over the same connection one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user. As such, claim 27 functionally recites the features of the claimed apparatus. The cited portion of the MPEP indicates “features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally.” See MPEP § 2114. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection under Section 103

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over MacNaughton (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,393) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,993). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-27 because neither MacNaughton, Kumar, or any combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of the amended independent claims 1, 22, and 27.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method of retrieving electronic data from a communications system. The method includes, *inter alia*, establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user. The method also includes initiating a first communication session over the connection associated with the first account of the user maintained by the host system; and automatically initiating, over the same connection to the host system, one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user maintained by the host system.

MacNaughton discloses “a system and method for integrating an on-line service community with a foreign service such as the Internet World Wide Web.” See MacNaughton at Abstract. The Office action concedes that MacNaughton does not explicitly show automatically initiating over the same connection one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in original claim 1. See Office action of September 21, 2004 at page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 2. For this teaching, the Office action relies on Kumar. See Office action of September 21, 2004 at page 4, lines 7-18 citing Kumar at Fig. 2 and col. 12, lines 9-26.

Kumar discloses a search function that searches Internet sites and, in a preferred embodiment, the search function is provided by a subscription portal server. See Kumar at

Abstract. In one implementation, Kumar discloses an Internet portal server 15 through which a user of an Internet appliance 17 is able to log-on and access one or more Internet servers 23, 25 and 27. See Kumar at FIG. 1 and col. 5, line 65 to col. 7, line 15. Each of the Internet servers 23, 25 and 27 are “hosted by various enterprises and subscribed to by a user operating appliance 17” and accessible through the Internet portal server 15 that connects to the Internet 13 through which the Internet servers 23, 25 and 27 are accessed. See Kumar at col. 6, lines 30 and 52-55. Kumar also discloses that the Internet portal server 15 provides Internet access services for individual subscribers and may be only accessible to a user based on an authenticated user name and password. See Kumar at col. 6, lines 15-17 and 42-44.

In Kumar's system, the Internet appliance 17 connects to the Internet portal server 15 through a telephone line or other type of an access line 19. See Kumar at col. 6, lines 35-40. The Internet portal server 15 of Kumar is connected to the Internet, through which Internet servers 23, 25 and 27 are accessible, using conventional equipment, included IP data routes, data switches, gateway routers. See Kumar at col. 6, lines 31-34. Once a user has been granted access to the Internet portal server 15, the Internet portal server 15 provides a personalized portal page that lists hyperlinks specifying URLs (Uniform Resource Locators) for destinations on servers 23, 25 and 27 that a user may access by manual selection of the appropriate hyperlink. See Kumar at col. 7, lines 17-43 and FIG. 2. When a user manually selects a hyperlink for navigation to the destination associated with the hyperlink, the Internet portal server 15 invokes the hyperlink to navigate to the destination and provides a user name and password associated with the selected hyperlink. See Kumar at col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 6. See also Kumar at col. 12, lines 22-26. Hence, Kumar shows, in this implementation, a log-in to the selected destination that occurs on a destination system 23, 25 or 27 accessible to the Internet portal server 15 over the Internet 13. In other words, Kumar discloses an Internet portal server (15) that is capable of processing manual user requests to log into one or more additional accounts of the user that are located on destination servers other than the Internet portal server (15). Thus, Kumar uses login information to enable sessions between the Internet appliance 17 and each of several different destination servers, and, hence, Kumar does not disclose using login information to enable multiple sessions to the Internet portal server 15. Moreover, Kumar only discloses only one

communication session using the single connection between the Internet appliance 17 and the Internet portal server 15.

Kumar's Internet appliance 17 corresponds most closely to the client system recited in claim 1. Because Kumar establishes a connection between the Internet appliance 17 and the Internet portal server 15 and amended claim 1 recites establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user, Kumar's portal server 15 corresponds most closely to the host system recited in amended claim 1.¹ Because Kumar does not describe or suggest using login information to enable multiple sessions to the Internet portal server 15 (which corresponds most closely to the host system recited in amended claim 1), Kumar necessarily cannot describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection to the host system, one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user maintained by the host system, recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, because Kumar only discloses only one communication session using the single connection between the Internet appliance 17 and the Internet portal server 15, Kumar necessarily cannot describe or suggest initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, this implementation of Kumar does not describe or suggest initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in amended claim 1.

In another implementation, Kumar discloses a browser that operates on a client system and, when a user navigates to a destination that requires a secure log-in, provides log-in data that is stored on the client system, and does so without accessing the personalized portal page stored on the Internet server portal. See Kumar at col. 9, lines 9-21. Kumar does not explicitly disclose whether, in this implementation, the destination is accessed through an intermediary server, such as the Internet portal server or another type of Internet service provider server. If, in this implementation, Kumar's Internet portal server or another Internet service provider server provides the Internet access by which the destination system is accessed by the browser, for at

¹ The underlined portion was added by this amendment, and, naturally, was not addressed by the Office action.

least the reasons discussed above, Kumar also fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in amended claim 1.

On the other hand, if there is no Internet service provider system in this implementation of Kumar, Kumar's destination may correspond to the host system recited in amended claim 1. Even in such a case, however, Kumar discloses only one communication session being established with the host system, as well as the use of only one user account. Thus, this implementation of Kumar discloses, at most, establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user, and initiating a first communication session over the connection associated with the first account of the user. Kumar, in this implementation, does not describe or suggest automatically initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in amended claim 1.

In yet another implementation, Kumar discloses a search function that a user may invoke from the personalized portal page on the Internet server portal in which the search function searches one or more selected destinations listed on the personalized portal page according to search criteria entered by the user. See Kumar at col. 9, lines 32-42. Here, too, Kumar discloses accessing (here, searching) destination servers identified by the personalized portal page. For least the reasons described above, this implementation of Kumar also fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, assuming for the sake of argument only that Kumar is somehow deemed to disclose enabling access to multiple accounts over a single connection to the host of those multiple accounts, Kumar does not disclose providing access to each of those multiple accounts in an automated fashion, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, Kumar fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection to the host system, one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user maintained by the host system, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Kumar, MacNaughton, nor the combination of the two references describe or suggest automatically initiating over the same connection to the host system one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-21.

Similarly to independent claim 1, claims 22 and 27 each recite similar features in the context of a computer-readable medium and an apparatus, respectively. Claims 2-21 and 23-26 depend from claims 1 or 22, respectively.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27 and dependent claims 23-26 that depend from claim 22.

Newly Added Claims 28-41

Each of claims 28-41 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. At least for the reason of that dependency, applicant submits that claims 28-41 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated September 21, 2004, be extended for one month to and including January 21, 2005.

Applicant : Zhaoxi Bu et al.
Serial No. : 09/842,025
Filed : April 26, 2001
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-083001 /
Communications 14

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$820.00 for excess claim fees (\$700.00) and the extension of time fee (\$120.00). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2005



Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40245863.doc